

*REMARKS*

In response to the Official Action mailed October 8, 2004, Applicant amends his application and requests reconsideration. In this Amendment, no claims are added and claims 2 and 4-6 are canceled so that claims 1, 3, and 7-12 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

Claims 7-12 are allowed.

The Examiner objected to the drawings, asserting that the limitation of claim 5 was not illustrated in any figure. In view of the cancellation of claim 5, the drawing objection is moot.

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitation of claim 6.

The Official Action rejected claims 1-5 as anticipated by Namba et al. (6,230,846, hereinafter Namba). Amended claim 1 includes the limitations of canceled claim 6. The Official Action does not contend that Namba teaches the limitations of claim 6. Accordingly, the rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

The Official Action rejected claims 1-5 as unpatentable over Aulanko et al. (EP 631,966, hereinafter Aulanko) in view of Namba. Amended claim 1 includes the limitations of canceled claim 6. The Official Action does not contend that the combination of Aulanko and Namba teaches or suggests the limitations of claim 6. Accordingly, the rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

The Official Action rejected claims 1-6 as unpatentable over Kurosawa (JP 11-060117, hereinafter Kurosawa) in view of Namba. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

The combination of Kurosawa and Namba fails to teach or suggest every limitation of amended claim 1. Namely, the combination fails to teach or suggest that a *control panel is located in the hoistway between two of the openings* and further that the same *control panel being disposed within the hoistway on said face* [that includes the plurality of openings], as claimed. To teach or suggest the claimed invention, the combination of Kurosawa and Namba must teach or suggest a control panel disposed on the face of a hoistway that includes openings. Namba clearly fails to show this feature; the control panel of Namba is located on a face of the hoistway that does not have openings (see Figures 3 and 5 of Namba). Kurosawa also fails to disclose a control panel on the face of the hoistway having openings, since the control panel 16 of Kurosawa is not disposed on a face of the hoistway at all (see Figures 3, 5, and 7 of Kurosawa).

Moreover, to render the claimed invention unpatentable, the combination of Kurosawa and Namba must show a control panel located between the openings in the face of the hoistway.

In re Appln. of Shigeki YAMAKAWA  
Application No. 09/889,665

The Official Action asserts that the control panel 16 of Kurosawa is located between the openings in the hoistway shown in Figures 3, 5, and 7 (Applicants note that Figures 3 and 7 do not show control panel 16). However, Kurosawa clearly shows that the control panel 16 is located directly **in front of** an opening in the hoistway, not **between** two openings (see Figure 5 of Kurosawa). Namba also clearly fails to show a control panel located between openings.

Thus, the combination of Kurosawa and Namba fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-3 is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
A. Wesley Ferrebee, Reg. No. 51,312  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER  
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20005-3960  
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)  
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: Dec. 1, 2004  
AWF:

Amendment or ROA - Regular (Revised 9/03/03)